



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/901,974	07/09/2001	Shell Sterling Simpson	10007647-1	7274

7590 05/28/2008
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

SINGH, SATWANT K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2625

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/28/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/901,974	Applicant(s) SIMPSON ET AL.	
	Examiner SATWANT K. SINGH	Art Unit 2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 February 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-9,11-15,17-21,23-32 and 34-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-9,11-15,17-21,23-32 and 34-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Arguments

1. The finality of the rejection of the last Office action is withdrawn.
2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 8, 14, 20, 26, and 32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 23, 24, 26-29, 30, 31, 34, 36, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mathieson (US 6,976,072) in view of Roosen et al. (US 6,856,413).
5. Regarding Claim 1, Mathieson teaches a method for providing queue management and production device status in a distributed environment, comprising: providing a queue configured to contain production data directed to each of a plurality of production devices (Figs. 2 and 3) (display status for jobs stored on network server 22 and peripheral device 26) (col. 1, lines 58-67) (device can manage any number of job queues that may exist on the network) (col. 2, lines 26-28); placing first production data and second production data received from one or more clients in the queue (job is a print job but can be any copy, print, fax, scan etc. job) (col. 2, lines 10-16), the first production data including first production options for a first target document identified by one of the one or more clients (job in the server queue 24), the second production data

including second production options for a second target document identified by one of the one or more clients (job in the device queue 28); generating a queue interface having user accessible controls for managing the first and second production data held in the queue (Figs. 2 and 3), the first production data to be delivered from the queue to a first one of a plurality of production devices (server 22) and the second production data to be delivered from the queue to a second on the plurality of production devices (device 26) (col. 2, lines 17-28); presenting the queue interface to the client (Figs 2 and 3, user interface 16) (col. 2, lines 29-39).

Mathieson fails to teach a method generating a status interface for a chosen one of the first and second production device selected through the queue interface; and presenting the status interface to the client.

Roosen et al teaches a method generating a status interface for a chosen one of the first and second production device selected through the queue interface (double clicking of the mouse on the name of a print job); and presenting the status interface to the client (user can see the status of the job in the queue) (col. 7, lines 61-67, col. 8, lines 1-6).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Mathieson with the teaching of Roosen to allow a user to select a specific print job so the user can see the current status of the selected print job.

6. Regarding claim 2, Mathieson teaches a method, further comprising managing the first and second production data in the queue in accordance with instructions

entered through the queue interface (user can change the priority of the jobs simply by dragging the jobs to different locations on the user interface) (col. 2, lines 40-47).

7. Regarding Claim 5, Mathieson teaches a method, wherein the acts of generating and presenting the status interface for the chosen production devices comprise generating and presenting the status interface once the first or second production data is delivered to the chosen production device. (Figs. 2 and 3, status) (where the job is currently residing) (col. 2, lines 29-39 and lines 54-62).

8. Regarding Claim 6, Mathieson teaches a method, wherein the act of presenting the queue and status interfaces comprise generating and presenting a combined queue/status interface (Fig. 3, server 22, device 26) (jobs displayed according to the device where the job is currently residing) (col. 2, lines 54-62).

9. Regarding Claim 8, Mathieson teaches a method for mediating access to production devices, comprising: providing a queue configured to contain production data directed to each of a plurality of production devices (Figs. 2 and 3) (display status for jobs stored on network server 22 and peripheral device 26) (col. 1, lines 58-67) (device can manage any number of job queues that may exist on the network) (col. 2, lines 26-28); acquiring an access request for a first production device of the plurality of production devices, the access request originating from a client (computer includes a processor that accesses a queue manager program) (col. 1, lines 58-67); presenting to the client a production interface for the first production device, the interface having user accessible controls for selecting first production data identifying a target document and one or more production options (processor uses a User Interface (UI) to receive user

inputs and to display status for jobs stored on network server 22 and peripheral device 26) (col. 1, lines 58-67); placing in a queue the first production data received from the client and selected through the production interface, the first production data being directed to the first production device (Figs. 2 and 3) (job in server queue 24); placing in the queue second production data directed to a second production device of the plurality of production devices (Figs. 2 and 3) (job in device queue 28); generating a queue interface having user accessible controls for managing the first and second production data in the queue (Figs. 2 and 3) (user interface provides information on the jobs held in each of the two queues) (col. 2, lines 17-28); presenting the queue interface to the client (Figs 2 and 3, user interface 16) (col. 2, lines 29-39).

Mathieson fails to teach a method generating a status interface for a chosen one of the first and second production device selected through the queue interface; and presenting the status interface to the client.

Roosen et al teaches a method generating a status interface for a chosen one of the first and second production device selected through the queue interface (double clicking of the mouse on the name of a print job); and presenting the status interface to the client (user can see the status of the job in the queue) (col. 7, lines 61-67, col. 8, lines 1-6).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Mathieson with the teaching of Roosen to allow a user to select a specific print job so the user can see the current status of the selected print job.

10. Regarding Claim 11, Mathieson teaches a method, wherein the acts of generating and presenting the status interface for the chosen production devices comprise generating and presenting the status interface once the first or second production data is delivered to the chosen production device. (Figs. 2 and 3, status) (where the job is currently residing) (col. 2, lines 29-39 and lines 54-62).

11. Regarding Claim 12, Mathieson teaches a method, wherein the act of presenting the queue and status interfaces comprise generating and presenting a combined queue/status interface (Fig. 3, server 22, device 26) (jobs displayed according to the device where the job is currently residing) (col. 2, lines 54-62).

12. Regarding Claim 14, Mathieson teaches a computer program product for providing queue management and production device status in a distributed environment, the product comprising a computer useable medium having computer readable instructions thereon for: providing a queue configured to contain production data directed to each of a plurality of production devices (Figs. 2 and 3) (display status for jobs stored on network server 22 and peripheral device 26) (col. 1, lines 58-67) (device can manage any number of job queues that may exist on the network) (col. 2, lines 26-28); placing first production data and second production data received from one or more clients in the queue (job is a print job but can be any copy, print, fax, scan etc. job) (col. 2, lines 10-16), the first production data including first production options for a first target document identified by one of the one or more clients (job in the server queue 24), the second production data including second production options for a second target document identified by one of the one or more clients (job in the device

queue 28); generating a queue interface having user accessible controls for managing the first and second production data held in the queue (Figs. 2 and 3), the first production data to be delivered from the queue to a first one of a plurality of production devices (server 22) and the second production data to be delivered from the queue to a second on the plurality of production devices (device 26) (col. 2, lines 17-28); presenting the queue interface to the client (Figs 2 and 3, user interface 16) (col. 2, lines 29-39).

Mathieson fails to teach a computer program product generating a status interface for a chosen one of the first and second production device selected through the queue interface; and presenting the status interface to the client.

Roosen et al teaches a program product generating a status interface for a chosen one of the first and second production device selected through the queue interface (double clicking of the mouse on the name of a print job); and presenting the status interface to the client (user can see the status of the job in the queue) (col. 7, lines 61-67, col. 8, lines 1-6).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Mathieson with the teaching of Roosen to allow a user to select a specific print job so the user can see the current status of the selected print job.

13. Regarding claim 15, Mathieson teaches a program product further comprising instructions for managing the first and second production data in the queue in accordance with instructions entered through the queue interface (user can change the

priority of the jobs simply by dragging the jobs to different locations on the user interface) (col. 2, lines 40-47).

14. Regarding Claim 17, Mathieson teaches a program product, wherein the instructions for generating and presenting the status interface for the chosen production devices comprise generating and presenting the status interface once the first or second production data is delivered to the chosen production device. (Figs. 2 and 3, status) (where the job is currently residing) (col. 2, lines 29-39 and lines 54-62).

15. Regarding Claim 18, Mathieson teaches a program product, wherein the instructions for presenting the queue and status interfaces comprise generating and presenting a combined queue/status interface (Fig. 3, server 22, device 26) (jobs displayed according to the device where the job is currently residing) (col. 2, lines 54-62).

16. Regarding Claim 20, Mathieson teaches a computer program product for mediating access to production devices, the product comprising a computer useable medium having computer readable instructions thereon for: providing a queue configured to contain production data directed to each of a plurality of production devices (Figs. 2 and 3) (display status for jobs stored on network server 22 and peripheral device 26) (col. 1, lines 58-67) (device can manage any number of job queues that may exist on the network) (col. 2, lines 26-28); acquiring an access request for a first production device of the plurality of production devices, the access request originating from a client (computer includes a processor that accesses a queue manager program) (col. 1, lines 58-67); presenting to the client a production interface

for the first production device, the interface having user accessible controls for selecting first production data identifying a target document and one or more production options (processor uses a User Interface (UI) to receive user inputs and to display status for jobs stored on network server 22 and peripheral device 26) (col. 1, lines 58-67); placing in a queue the first production data received from the client and selected through the production interface, the first production data being directed to the first production device (Figs. 2 and 3) (job in server queue 24); placing in the queue second production data directed to a second production device of the plurality of production devices (Figs. 2 and 3) (job in device queue 28); generating a queue interface having user accessible controls for managing the first and second production data in the queue (Figs. 2 and 3) (user interface provides information on the jobs held in each of the two queues) (col. 2, lines 17-28); presenting the queue interface to the client (Figs 2 and 3, user interface 16) (col. 2, lines 29-39).

Mathieson fails to teach a program product generating a status interface for a chosen one of the first and second production device selected through the queue interface; and presenting the status interface to the client.

Roosen et al teaches a program product generating a status interface for a chosen one of the first and second production device selected through the queue interface (double clicking of the mouse on the name of a print job); and presenting the status interface to the client (user can see the status of the job in the queue) (col. 7, lines 61-67, col. 8, lines 1-6).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Mathieson with the teaching of Roosen to allow a user to select a specific print job so the user can see the current status of the selected print job.

17. Regarding Claim 23, Mathieson teaches a program product, wherein the instructions generating and presenting the status interface for the chosen production devices comprise generating and presenting the status interface once the first or second production data is delivered to the chosen production device. (Figs. 2 and 3, status) (where the job is currently residing) (col. 2, lines 29-39 and lines 54-62).

18. Regarding Claim 24, Mathieson teaches a program product, wherein the instructions presenting the queue and status interfaces comprise generating and presenting a combined queue/status interface (Fig. 3, server 22, device 26) (jobs displayed according to the device where the job is currently residing) (col. 2, lines 54-62).

19. Regarding Claim 26, Mathieson teaches in a computer network, a system for providing queue management and production device status, the system comprising: a client (Fig. 1, computer 14) operable to display a user interface (Fig. 1, User Interface (UI) 16) (col. 1, lines 58-67); a mediation service in electronic communication with the client and the production devices (Fig. 1, queue manager 15), the mediation service operable to place first and second production data received from the client in a queue (Figs. 2 and 3) (col. 2, lines 1-9), the first production data being directed to a first production device of the plurality of production devices and including first production

options for a first target document identified by the client (Figs. 2 and 3, server queue 24) (col. 2, lines 10-16), the second production data being directed to a second production device of the plurality of production devices and including second production options for a second target document identified by the client (Figs 2 and 3, device queue 28) (col. 2, lines 10-16), generate a queue interface having user accessible controls for managing the first and second production data held in the queue (Figs. 2 and 3) (processor uses a User Interface (UI) to receive user inputs and to display status for jobs stored on network server 22 and peripheral device 26) (col. 1, lines 58-67), present the queue interface to the client (Figs 2 and 3, user interface 16) (col. 2, lines 29-39).

Mathieson fails to teach a system comprising a plurality of production devices, each production device having a production server operable to generate a status interface for the particular production device; and present to the client the status interface for a chosen one of the first and second production devices selected through the queue interface.

Roosen et al teaches a system comprising a plurality of production devices, each production device having a production server operable to generate a status interface for the particular production device (Fig. 2, block 200, information server) (col. 3, lines 34-45); and present to the client the status interface for a chosen one of the first and second production devices selected through the queue interface (user can see the status of the job in the queue) (col. 7, lines 61-67, col. 8, lines 1-6).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Mathieson with the teaching of Roosen to allow a user to select a specific print job located on one of a plurality of printer so the user can see the current status of the selected print job.

20. Regarding Claim 27, Mathieson teaches a system, wherein the mediation service includes a queue manager operable to manage the first and second production data in the queue in accordance with instructions provided through the queue interface (user can change the priority of the jobs simply by dragging the jobs to different locations on the user interface) (col. 2, lines 40-47).

21. Regarding Claim 28, Mathieson fails to teach a system, wherein the mediation service includes an interface generator operable to present to the client the status interface for the chosen production device selected through the queue interface.

Roosen et al teaches a system, wherein the mediation service includes an interface generator operable to present to the client the status interface for the chosen production device selected through the queue interface (double clicking of the mouse on the name of a print job) (user can see the status of the job in the queue) (col. 7, lines 61-67, col. 8, lines 1-6).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Mathieson with the teaching of Roosen to allow a user to select a specific print job located on one of a plurality of printer so the user can see the current status of the selected print job.

22. Regarding Claim 29, Mathieson teaches a system, wherein the interface generator is further operable to generate and present the queue and status interfaces in the form of a combined queue/status interface (Fig. 3, server 22, device 26) (jobs displayed according to the device where the job is currently residing) (col. 2, lines 54-62).

23. Regarding Claim 31, Mathieson teaches a system, further comprising an interface generator operable to present to the client the status interface for the chosen production device once production data is delivered from the queue to that device (Figs. 2 and 3, status) (where the job is currently residing) (col. 2, lines 29-39 and lines 54-62).

24. Regarding Claim 32, Mathieson teaches in a computer network, a system for providing queue management and production device status, the system comprising: a client operable to issue an access request for a first production device of the plurality of production devices (computer includes a processor that accesses a queue manager program) (col. 1, lines 58-67) and to display one or more interfaces (Fig 1, computer 14 and User interface (UI) 16); a queue for storing production data directed to each of the plurality of production devices (Figs.2 and 3) (col. 2, lines 17-28); an interface conduit in electronic communication with the client and the production server or servers (Fig. 1, queue manager 15), the interface conduit operable to acquire the access request originating from the client, present to the client a production interface for the production device to which the request is directed (user interface operated by the queue manager provides information on the jobs held in each of the two queues) (col. 2, lines 17-28), to place in the queue first production data received from the client and selected through

the production interface (Figs 2 and 3, server queue 24) , and to place in the queue second production data (Figs 2 and 3, device queue 28), the first production data being directed to the first production device and the second production data being directed to a second production device of the plurality of production devices (col. 2, lines 10-16); a queue manager operable to deliver the first and second production data from the queue to the production server for the production device to which that production data is to be delivered (job is sent from the computer to the server queue) (col. 2, lines 10-11) (queue manager allows a user or administrator to manage jobs in the two queues) (col. 2, lines 17-28)..

Mathieson fails to teach a system comprising: a plurality of production devices each having a production server operable to generate a status interface and manage production of a target document; and an interface generator operable to generate and present to the client a queue interface and to present to the client the status interface for a chosen one of the first and second production devices selected through the queue interface.

Roosen et al teaches a system comprising: a plurality of production devices each having a production server operable to generate a status interface and manage production of a target document (Fig. 2, block 200, information server) (col. 3, lines 34-45); and an interface generator operable to generate and present to the client a queue interface and to present to the client the status interface for a chosen one of the first and second production devices selected through the queue interface (double clicking of the

Art Unit: 2625

mouse on the name of a print job) (user can see the status of the job in the queue) (col. 7, lines 61-67, col. 8, lines 1-6).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Mathieson with the teaching of Roosen to allow a user to select a specific print job located on one of a plurality of printer so the user can see the current status of the selected print job.

25. Regarding Claim 34, Mathieson teaches a system, wherein the interface generator is further operable to generate and present the queue and status interfaces in the form of a combined queue/status interface (Fig. 3, server 22, device 26) (jobs displayed according to the device where the job is currently residing) (col. 2, lines 54-62).

26. Regarding Claim 36, Mathieson teaches a system, further comprising an interface generator operable to present to the client the status interface for the chosen production device once the first or second production data is delivered to the chosen production device (Figs. 2 and 3, status) (where the job is currently residing) (col. 2, lines 29-39 and lines 54-62).

27. Regarding claim 38, Mathieson teaches a system, wherein the queue manager is further operable to manage production data in the queue in accordance with instructions entered through the queue interface (user can change the priority of the jobs simply by dragging the jobs to different locations on the user interface) (col. 2, lines 40-47).

28. Claims 3, 7, 9, 13, 19, 21, 25, 30, 35, and 37 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mathieson and Roosen et al as applied to claims 1, 8, 14, 20, 26, and 32 above, and further in view of Barnard et al. (US 6,920,506)

29. Regarding Claims 3 and 9, Mathieson and Roosen et al fail to teach a method wherein the acts of generating the queue and status interfaces comprise generating the queue and status interfaces each in the form of a web page.

Barnard et al teaches a method wherein the acts of generating the queue and status interfaces comprise generating the queue and status interfaces each in the form of a web page (Fig. 6, queue service web page) (view and manage all print queues supported by network management device 20 and other network management devices, and to view and manage print jobs within each respective print queue) (col. 9, lines 53-67, col. 10, lines 1-13).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Mathieson and Roosen with the teaching of Barnard to generate the print queue in the form of a web page to allow a user to quickly and efficiently manage the print queue.

30. Regarding Claims 7 and 13, Mathieson and Roosen et al fail to teach a method wherein: the act of generating the queue interface comprises generating the queue interface in the form of a web page; the act of generating the status interface comprises generating the status interface in the form of a web page; and the act of generating the combined queue/status interface comprises generating the combined queue/status interface in the form of a framed web page.

Barnard et al teaches a method wherein: the act of generating the queue interface comprises generating the queue interface in the form of a web page; the act of generating the status interface comprises generating the status interface in the form of a web page; and the act of generating the combined queue/status interface comprises generating the combined queue/status interface in the form of a framed web page (Fig. 6, queue service web page) (view and manage all print queues supported by network management device 20 and other network management devices, and to view and manage print jobs within each respective print queue) (col. 9, lines 53-67, col. 10, lines 1-13).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Mathieson and Roosen with the teaching of Barnard to generate the print queue in the form of a web page to allow a user to quickly and efficiently manage the print queue.

31. Regarding Claim 21, Mathieson and Roosen et al fail to teach a program product wherein the instructions for generating the queue and status interfaces comprise instructions for generating the queue and status interfaces each in the form of a web page.

Barnard et al teaches a program product wherein the instructions for generating the queue and status interfaces comprise instructions for generating the queue and status interfaces each in the form of a web page (Fig. 6, queue service web page) (view and manage all print queues supported by network management device 20 and other

network management devices, and to view and manage print jobs within each respective print queue) (col. 9, lines 53-67, col. 10, lines 1-13).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Mathieson and Roosen with the teaching of Barnard to generate the print queue in the form of a web page to allow a user to quickly and efficiently manage the print queue.

32. Regarding Claims 19 and 25, Mathieson and Roosen et al fail to teach a program product wherein: the instructions for generating the queue interface comprise instructions for generating the queue interface in the form of a web page; the instructions for generating the status interface comprise instructions for generating the status interface in the form of a web page; and the instructions for generating the combined queue/status interface comprise instructions for generating the combined queue/status interface in the form of a framed web page.

Barnard et al teaches a program product wherein: the instructions for generating the queue interface comprise instructions for generating the queue interface in the form of a web page; the instructions for generating the status interface comprise instructions for generating the status interface in the form of a web page; and the instructions for generating the combined queue/status interface comprise instructions for generating the combined queue/status interface in the form of a framed web page (Fig. 6, queue service web page) (view and manage all print queues supported by network management device 20 and other network management devices, and to view and

Art Unit: 2625

manage print jobs within each respective print queue) (col. 9, lines 53-67, col. 10, lines 1-13).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Mathieson and Roosen with the teaching of Barnard to generate the print queue in the form of a web page to allow a user to quickly and efficiently manage the print queue.

33. Regarding Claim 30, Mathieson and Roosen et al fail to teach a system wherein: at least one of the production servers includes a web server operable to generate the status queue in the form of a web page associated with a first network address (Fig. 4, ; and the interface generator of the mediation service functions, at least in part, as a web server operable to generate the queue interface in the form of a web page associated with a second network address and to present the combined queue/status interface in the form of a framed web page having a first frame referencing the first network address and a second frame referencing the second network address.

Barnard et al teaches a system wherein: at least one of the production servers includes a web server (Fig. 4, web server 76) operable to generate the status queue in the form of a web page associated with a first network address (Fig. 6, print queue web page); and the interface generator of the mediation service functions, at least in part, as a web server operable to generate the queue interface in the form of a web page associated with a second network address and to present the combined queue/status interface in the form of a framed web page having a first frame referencing the first network address and a second frame referencing the second network address (Fig. 6,

Art Unit: 2625

queue service web page) (view and manage all print queues supported by network management device 20 and other network management devices, and to view and manage print jobs within each respective print queue) (col. 9, lines 53-67, col. 10, lines 1-13).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Mathieson and Roosen with the teaching of Barnard to generate the print queue in the form of a web page to allow a user to quickly and efficiently manage the print queue.

34. Regarding Claim 35, Mathieson and Roosen et al fail to teach a system wherein: the interface generator and at least one of the production servers each function, at least in part, as a web server; the production server being further operable to generate the status interface in the form of a web page associated with a first network address; and the interface generator being further operable to generate the queue interface in the form of a web page associated with a second network address and to present the combined queue/status interface in the form of a framed web page referencing the first and second network addresses.

Barnard et al teaches a system wherein: the interface generator and at least one of the production servers each function, at least in part, as a web server; the production server being further operable to generate the status interface in the form of a web page associated with a first network address; and the interface generator being further operable to generate the queue interface in the form of a web page associated with a second network address and to present the combined queue/status interface in the form

of a framed web page referencing the first and second network addresses (Fig. 6, queue service web page) (view and manage all print queues supported by network management device 20 and other network management devices, and to view and manage print jobs within each respective print queue) (col. 9, lines 53-67, col. 10, lines 1-13).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Mathieson and Roosen with the teaching of Barnard to generate the print queue in the form of a web page to allow a user to quickly and efficiently manage the print queue.

35. Regarding Claim 37, Mathieson and Roosen et al fail to teach a system wherein: the interface generator and at least one of the production servers function at least in part as web servers; the production server being further operable to generate the status interface in the form of a first web page; and the interface generator being further operable to generate the queue interface in the form of a second web page.

Barnard et al teaches a system wherein: the interface generator and at least one of the production servers function at least in part as web servers; the production server being further operable to generate the status interface in the form of a first web page; and the interface generator being further operable to generate the queue interface in the form of a second web page (Fig. 6, queue service web page) (view and manage all print queues supported by network management device 20 and other network management devices, and to view and manage print jobs within each respective print queue) (col. 9, lines 53-67, col. 10, lines 1-13).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined the teachings of Mathieson and Roosen with the teaching of Barnard to generate the print queue in the form of a web page to allow a user to quickly and efficiently manage the print queue.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SATWANT K. SINGH whose telephone number is (571)272-7468. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on (571) 272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Satwant K. Singh

Application/Control Number: 09/901,974
Art Unit: 2625

Page 23

Examiner
Art Unit 2625

/David K Moore/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2625

sks